



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,443	06/26/2001	Zhi Wang	46806.00007	7401

7590 08/26/2004

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.

Two Renaissance Square
Suite 2700
40 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4498

EXAMINER

CHAVIS, JOHN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/891,443

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

John Chavis

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2124

Oath/Declaration

1. The full name of each inventor (family name and at least one given name together with any initial) has not been set forth. Also, each inventor must sign the oath and currently at least one signature has been omitted.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too long. It is longer than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tso et al. (6,421,733).

Claims

1. A method for providing derivative content from provided primary content, the method comprising:

parsing guidance in accordance with a markup abstract language having elements;

parsing being performed to provide a tree representation;

the guidance comprising a first element comprising a call, a first declaration of a first subroutine, and a second declaration of a second subroutine nested within the first declaration; and

providing derivative content in accordance with the primary content as directed by traversing the tree representation;

wherein traversing comprises performing in a first execution context until encountering the to

Tso

See the title and the abstract of the invention.

See the last sentence of the
and col. 8 lines 41-50, the Web pages provide for markup language elements.

See col. 8 lines 25-34.

See col. 3 lines 11-14, col. 4 lines 49-61 and col. 5 lines 8-19.

See col. 5 lines 26-31.

See col. 8 lines 28-34 and the cited portions above in reference

call, performing the second subroutine in an execution context identified in the declaration of the second subroutine, and

returning to performance in the first execution context after the call; and wherein the call comprises a first user-defined element identifying the first subroutine, and

a second user-defined element identifying the second subroutine, the second element being nested within the first element.

2. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the first user-defined element and the second user-defined element comprises a tag.

3. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the first subroutine and the second subroutine includes an operation using a parameter passed by value.

4. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the first subroutine and the second subroutine includes an operation using a parameter passed by reference

5. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the first subroutine and the second subroutine includes an operation using a parameter value, wherein the value is at least one of a string and a tree.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of *the* first subroutine and the second subroutine returns at least one of a string and a tree.

7. The method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the first subroutine and the second subroutine includes at least one of an operation using a first tree or a return value being a second tree, wherein at least one of the

calls.

This is considered the essence of executing calls via a tree structure.

See col. 14 lines 11-36, which provides for the nesting feature via lines 14-17.

This feature is taught via the Web page URL's indicated in the cited portions of col. 14 above. See also col. 3 lines 51-54.

See again the cited portions of col. 14, specifically lines 21-36.

See again the cited portions of col. 14, specifically lines 21-36.

See again the cited portions above.

See again the cited portions above.

See col. 4 lines 14-37.

first tree and the second tree comprises a document object model.

8. A data storage device comprising indicia of the method of claim 1.

See fig. 3 item 34.

9. A communication system comprising the data storage device of claim 8.

See fig. 3 items 34, 16 and 18.

In reference to the features of claims 10-11, see the rejection of claim 1. For the language processor, see col. 8 lines 41-54.

As per claims 12-13, see the rejections of claims 8-9.

Claims 14-17 are rejected as claims 10-13.

The features of claims 18-20 are taught via claims 1, 8 and 9.

In reference to claims 21-24, see the rejection of claim 10. See again fig. 3 for the plurality of access devices, specifically item 18.

Conclusion

The patent to Luther (5,555,343), although not specifically cited, is also considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (703) 305-9665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jqc
August 20, 2004



JOHN CHAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2124